



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/673,381	10/16/2000	Hiroshi Omura	KP-8931	6863

466 7590 01/26/2006

YOUNG & THOMPSON
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET
2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

AGGARWAL, YOGESH K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2615

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/673,381	Applicant(s) OMURA ET AL.	
	Examiner Yogesh K. Aggarwal	Art Unit 2615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2615

Examiner's response:

1. Applicant argues with regards to claim 12 that Silverbrook teaches the print head illumination range to be same as an exposure area of a recording medium while the present claim requires an illumination range to be larger than the exposure area of the instant film. **The Examiner respectfully disagrees.** Applicant's admitted prior art has been used to teach an instant film unit having an exposure area that is smaller than the total size of the film (e.g. monosheet type instant film unit 20 having exposure area 21 in figure 4a). Mono sheet type instant films as admitted were used in prior art (See Page 1 and 2 of the applicant specification, Also Page 10 lines 19-22 clearly teach that mono sheet type instant film is well known wherein the light is applied to an exposure area 21 shorter than the total size of the instant film).

2. In a preferred embodiment, Silverbrook uses an inkjet printing technique. However Silverbrook teaches that the printing apparatus and method are used in a wide range of applications including portable printers incorporated into digital instant cameras (col. 24 lines 46-59) using instant film units like the mono sheets taught in Applicant's admitted prior art. Silverbrook further teaches that the print head 50 is the full width of the recording medium 51 (col. 33 lines 10-15) so that it is only necessary to move the recording medium 51. **If an instant film is used which has an exposure area of a predetermined size as taught by Admitted prior art** (and as explained above), the print head 50 will be full width of the instant film. **Therefore illumination range of the printing light on the instant film by the exposure device will be determined to be larger than the exposure area on an instant film.** Hence if the print head size is larger than the exposure area as taught by the combination of Admitted prior art and

Art Unit: 2615

Silverbrook, even where the instant film deviates from a predetermined position relative to the exposure an entire exposure are will be exposed.

3. The recited claimed limitation “an illumination range of the printing light on the instant film by the exposure device is determined to be larger than the exposure area, so the entire exposure area may be exposed even where the instant film deviates from a predetermined position relative to the exposure device” is taught in combination of Applicant’s admitted prior art in view of Silverbrook wherein “an illumination range of the printing light to be same as the recording medium is taught in Silverbrook while an instant film having an exposure area smaller than the size of the instant film is taught in Applicant’s admitted prior art. Therefore taking the combined teachings of Applicant’s admitted prior art and Silverbrook, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that **if an instant film having an exposure area smaller than the size of the instant film is used in the apparatus of Silverbrook, the range of illumination of printing head will be larger than the exposure area of the instant film.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 11 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant’s admitted prior art in view of Silverbrook (US Patent # 5,805,178).

[Claim 11]

Art Unit: 2615

A printing method for recording a latent image in an exposure area of a predetermined size on an instant film that includes a processing fluid, by projecting printing light from an exposure device onto the instant film based on image data, and developing the latent image into a positive image by spreading the processing fluid over the exposed instant film through a pair of spread rollers (Page 1 lines 20-23, Page 2 lines 2-10).

Admitted prior art fails to teach an illumination range of the printing light on the instant film by the exposure device is determined to be larger than the exposure area, so the entire exposure area may be exposed even where the instant film deviates from a predetermined position relative to the exposure device.

However Silverbrook teaches a printing apparatus and method that are used in a wide range of applications including portable printers incorporated into digital instant cameras (col. 24 lines 46-59). Silverbrook further teaches a printing method of a digital electronic printing system using a print head 50 printing an image 60 onto a recording medium 51 (col. 32 lines 21-26, figure 6). Silverbrook teaches that the print head 50 is the full width of the recording medium 51 (col. 33 lines 10-15) so that it is only necessary to move the recording medium 51. If an instant film is used which has an exposure area of a predetermined size as taught by Admitted prior art, the print head 50 will be full width of the instant film. Therefore illumination range of the printing light on the instant film by the exposure device will be determined to be larger than the exposure area on an instant film.

Therefore taking the combined teachings of Applicant's admitted prior art and Silverbrook, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to have used the printing head of the same width as the recording medium into an

Art Unit: 2615

instant camera having an instant film having an exposure area of predetermined size so that the entire exposure area may be exposed even where the instant film deviates from a predetermined position relative to the exposure device in order to have the recording medium that moves and not the printing head that simplifies the overall process.

[Claim 22]

Silverbrook clearly teaches in figure 6 an image 60 (read as an exposure area) smaller than the overall dimensions of the recording medium 51.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-10, 21 are allowed.

See the previous office action for reasons of allowance.

4. Claim 12 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for indicating allowable subject matter:

5. As for claim 12, the prior art of record does not teach or fairly suggest the size of the illumination range relative to the exposure area is determined in accordance with clearances provided between the case and the instant film.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2615


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yogesh K. Aggarwal whose telephone number is (571) 272-7360. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM-5:30PM.

7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571)-272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

YKA


DAVID OMETZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER